arXiv:0705.2549v1 [quant-ph] 17 May 2007

Optimal discrimination between quantum operations

Lvzhou Li and Daowen Qiu*
Department of Computer Science, Zhongshan University, Guangzhou 510275, People's Republic of China

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

In this paper, we address the problem of discriminating two given quantum operations. Firstly, based on the Bloch representation of single qubit systems, we give the exact minimum error probability of discriminating two single qubit quantum operations by unentangled input states. In particular, for the Pauli channels discussed in [Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062340 (2005)], we use a more intuitional and visual method to deal with their discrimination problem. Secondly, we consider the condition for perfect discrimination of two quantum operations. Specially, we get that two generalized Pauli channels are perfectly distinguishable if and only if their characteristic vectors are orthogonal.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk, 03.65.Tz

I. INTRODUCTION

Discrimination between quantum states is a fundamental task in quantum information. It is well know that nonorthogonal quantum states can not be discriminated perfectly. However, it is possible to discriminate them in some relaxed ways. Typically, two nontrivial discrimination schemes have been considered for nonorthogonal states: one is the minimum-error discrimination [1], where each measurement outcome selects one of the possible states and the error probability is minimum, and the other is the optimal unambiguous discrimination [2], where unambiguity is paid by the possibility of getting inconclusive results from the measurement. For a recent review on the problem of discrimination between quantum states, we would like to refer the reader to [3].

The problem of discrimination can also be applied to quantum operations [4]. In Refs. [5, 6, 7, 8], the authors considered discrimination between unitary transformations (special quantum operations), and they found that entanglement-assisted input can not enhance the distinguishability of unitary transformations. For the problem of discriminating general quantum operations, however, there is not very much work, and the first work on this problem may be owed to Sacchi [9, 10]. In Refs. [9, 10], the problem for discriminating general quantum operations was firstly formulated, and the problem for discriminating Pauli channels was also addressed in detail. Specially, Sacchi [9, 10] showed that unlike unitary transformations [5, 6, 7], entangled input states generally enhance the distinguishability of general quantum operations. Also, Pauli channels, as a nontrivial kind of quantum operations, were considered by [11] in the approach of minimax discrimination. In addition, the unambiguous scheme was also discussed for general quantum operations by [12], where a necessary and sufficient condition was given for a given set of quantum operations to be unambiguously distinguishable. By the way, recently there is another interesting problem addressed by [13], which considered unambiguous discrimination among oracle operators.

In this paper, we focus on the problem of minimum-error discrimination between two quantum operations $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$. This problem can be reformulated into the problem of finding in the input Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ the state ρ such that the error probability in the discrimination of the output states $\mathcal{E}_1(\rho)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2(\rho)$ is minimum. We call such a strategy as *non-entanglement strategy*. Also, we have another strategy, called *entanglement strategy*, where we can introduce entanglement-assisted input states to increase the distinguishability of the output states. In this case, the output states to be discriminated will be of the form $(\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes \mathcal{I})\rho$ and $(\mathcal{E}_2 \otimes \mathcal{I})\rho$, where the input ρ is generally a bipartite state of $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$, and the quantum operations act just on the first party whereas the identity map $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{K}}$ acts on the second. It is suitable to assume that $\mathcal{K} = \mathcal{H}$, and in the sequel, we always use this assumption.

We denote with P_E the minimum error probability when a strategy without ancilla is adopted. Then we have [10]

$$P_E(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{H}} ||p_1\mathcal{E}_1(\rho) - p_2\mathcal{E}_2(\rho)||_1\Big), \quad (1)$$

where p_1 and p_2 are the *a priori* probabilities for quantum operations $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$, respectively, and $||A||_1$ denotes the trace norm defined as $||A||_1 = \mathrm{Tr}\sqrt{A^\dagger A}$. In particular, if A is Hermitian, then

$$||A||_1 = \sum_i |\lambda_i(A)|, \quad (2)$$

where $\lambda_i(A)$ denote the all eigenvalues of A. On the other hand, by allowing the use of entangled input, we have [10]

$$P_E^{'}(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2) = \frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \max_{\rho \in \mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{K}} ||p_1(\mathcal{E}_1 \otimes I)\rho - p_2(\mathcal{E}_2 \otimes I)\rho||_1\Big). \quad (3)$$

It is readily seen that in both Eqs. (1) and (3), the maximum value is achieved by pure states, and thus, in the following, we need only consider pure states as input states.

---

*Electronic address: issqdw@mail.sysu.edu.cn (D. Qiu).

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, firstly we give the exact minimum error probability of discriminating two single qubit quantum operations with non-entanglement strategy, and then by applying these results to Pauli channels [9, 10], we obtained a more intuitional and visual solution for the problem of discriminating Pauli channels. In Sec. III, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for given two quantum operations to be perfectly distinguishable. Furthermore, we get that two generalized Pauli channels are perfectly distinguishable if and only if their characteristic vectors are orthogonal. Finally, some conclusions are made in Sec. IV.

II. DISCRIMINATION OF SINGLE QUBIT QUANTUM OPERATIONS

In the following, we address the problem of minimum-error discrimination of single qubit quantum operations. Indeed, we can make use of the Bloch representation [4] of single qubit systems to evaluate the value of P_E. Let $\mathcal{H}_2$ denote the Hilbert space of a qubit system. Then it is well know that any $\rho \in \mathcal{H}_2$ can always be written in the form

$$\rho = \frac{I + \vec{r}\cdot\vec{\sigma}}{2} \tag{4}$$

where $\vec{r} = (r_x, r_y, r_z)$ is a three-dimensional real vector with norm $||\vec{r}|| \leq 1$ ($||\cdot||$ denotes the *Euclidean norm* on $\mathbf{C}^n$), and $\vec{r}\cdot\vec{\sigma} = r_x\sigma_x + r_y\sigma_y + r_z\sigma_z$ with $\{\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z\}$ denoting the Pauli operators [4]. In this way, $\vec{r}$ is called the *Bloch vector* of ρ, and they have a one-to-one relation. Also, we have that ρ is a pure state if and only if $||\vec{r}|| = 1$.

Based on the Bloch representation, we can visualize the effect of any trace-preserving single qubit quantum operation $\mathcal{E}$ as the Bloch vector transformation [4]

$$\vec{r} \rightarrow \vec{r}\,' = M\vec{r} + \vec{c}, \tag{5}$$

where M is a 3×3 real matrix, and $\vec{c}$ is a three-dimensional real vector, all of which can be computed by the operator-sum representation of $\mathcal{E}$. Therefore, the quantum operation $\mathcal{E}$ on a single qubit is characterized by the 2-tuple $(M, \vec{c})$. For the details, we refer to [4].

Next, we try to explore the minimum error probability for discriminating two single qubit quantum operations. Before that, we give some useful results below.

Firstly, we have that

$$\frac{1}{2}(|a+b| + |a-b|) = \max\{|a|, |b|\}, \tag{6}$$

where a and b are any real numbers. This equation can be easily verified by discussing the two case: (1) $|a| \geq |b|$, (2) $|a| < |b|$.

Secondly, we have a useful lemma in the following.

Lemma 1. Let ρ_1 and ρ_2 be the density operators of a single qubit system, with *a priori* probabilities p_1 and p_2, respectively. Let $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$ be the Bloch vectors of ρ_1 and ρ_2, respectively. Then we have

$$||p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2||_1 = \max\Big\{|p_1 - p_2|, ||p_1\vec{r}_1 - p_2\vec{r}_2||\Big\}. \tag{7}$$

Proof. First, we note that $\vec{r}\cdot\vec{\sigma}$ has eigenvalues $\pm||\vec{r}||$. Then, by the Bloch representation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &||p_1\rho_1 - p_2\rho_2||_1 \\ =&\frac{1}{2}||p_1(I + \vec{r}_1\cdot\vec{\sigma}) - p_2(I + \vec{r}_2\cdot\vec{\sigma})||_1 \\ =&\frac{1}{2}||(p_1 - p_2)I + (p_1\vec{r}_1 - p_2\vec{r}_2)\vec{\sigma}||_1 \\ =&\frac{1}{2}(|a-b| + |a+b|), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where we let $a = p_1 - p_2$, and $b = ||p_1\vec{r}_1 - p_2\vec{r}_2)||$. Therefore, by Eq. (6), we have completed the proof. □

Now, suppose that $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ are two single qubit quantum operations, and by the Bloch representation $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ correspond to $(M_1, \vec{c}_1)$ and $(M_2, \vec{c}_2)$, respectively. Then, the minimum error probability of discriminating $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ with non-entanglement strategy can be evaluated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} P_E(\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2) =&\frac{1}{2}\Big(1 - \max_{|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}} ||p_1\mathcal{E}_1(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) - p_2\mathcal{E}_2(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)||_1\Big) \\ =&\frac{1}{2}\Big[1 - \max_{||\vec{r}||=1} \max\Big\{|p_1 - p_2|, ||p_1(M_1\vec{r} + \vec{c}_1) - p_2(M_2\vec{r} + \vec{c}_2)||\Big\}\Big] \\ =&\frac{1}{2}\Big[1 - \max\Big\{|p_1 - p_2|, \max_{||\vec{r}||=1} ||(p_1M_1 - p_2M_2)\vec{r} + (p_1\vec{c}_1 - p_2\vec{c}_2)||\Big\}\Big] \\ =&\frac{1}{2}\Big[1 - \max\Big\{|p_1 - p_2|, \max_{||\vec{r}||=1} ||M\vec{r} + \vec{c}||\Big\}\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where we denote $(p_1M_1 - p_2M_2)$ and $(p_1\vec{c}_1 - p_2\vec{c}_2)$ by M and $\vec{c}$, respectively. Note that the value $\max_{||\vec{r}||=1} ||M\vec{r}+$

$\vec{c}||$ can be computed exactly for any fixed M and $\vec{c}$. Therefore, the minimum error probability $P_E(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2)$ given above can be evaluated for any two given quantum operations on a single qubit system.

Below, we show explicitly how to compute the value $\max_{||\vec{r}||=1}||M\vec{r}+\vec{c}||$ by computing its square. Without loss of generality, suppose that

$$M=\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13}\\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23}\\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33}\end{pmatrix},\ \vec{c}=\begin{pmatrix} c_1\\ c_2\\ c_3\end{pmatrix},\ \vec{r}=\begin{pmatrix} x\\ y\\ z\end{pmatrix} \tag{10}$$

Then $||M\vec{r}+\vec{c}||^2=f(x,y,z)$, where function f defined as

$$\begin{aligned} f(x,y,z)=&(a_{11}x+a_{12}y+a_{13}z+c_1)^2\\ &+(a_{21}x+a_{22}y+a_{23}z+c_2)^2\\ &+(a_{31}x+a_{32}y+a_{33}z+c_3)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Now, the problem reduces to finding out the maximal value of $f(x,y,z)$ under the condition $x^2+y^2+z^2=1$. Clearly, this problem belongs to the class of constrained extremum problems [14], and we can solve it by the way of *Lagrange multipliers*.

Therefore, in the non-entanglement strategy, we have obtained the minimum error probability for discriminating two single qubit quantum operations. On the other hand, in the entanglement strategy, the minimum error probability $P_E^{'}(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2)$ has not been evaluated. However, our result implies a general upper bound for that, by noting that $P_E^{'}(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2)\leq P_E(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2)$.

In Eq. (9), there are some nontrivial special cases worthy of being pointed out:

(i) When $|p_1-p_2|\geq\max_{||\vec{r}||=1}||M\vec{r}+\vec{c}||$, we have that

$$P_E(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2)=\min\{p_1,p_2\}, \tag{12}$$

which implies that in this case no input state and no measurement are needed, and the minimum error can always be achieved by just guessing the most likely operation. We note that similar insight was also gained for discrimination of quantum states by [15], which found that for some set of states, measurement does not aid minimum-error discrimination, and the minimum error probability can always be achieved by guessing the most likely states.

(ii) In particular, when $\vec{c_1}=\vec{c_2}=0$, the minimum error probability can be evaluated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} &P_E(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2)\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\Big[1-\max\Big\{|p_1-p_2|,\max_{||\vec{r}||=1}||(p_1M_1-p_2M_2)\vec{r}||\Big\}\Big]\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\Big[1-\max\Big\{|p_1-p_2|,||p_1M_1-p_2M_2||_2\Big\}\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where $||A||_2$ denotes the *spectral norm* [16] of matrix A as:

$$\begin{aligned} ||A||_2&=\max\{\sqrt{\lambda}:\lambda\text{ is an eigenvalue of }A^{\dagger}A\}\\ &=\max_{||x||=1}||Ax||. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In Ref. [4], some important single qubit quantum operations were introduced, and they are bit flip, phase flip, bit-phase flip, depolarizing, phase damping, and amplitude damping channels. One can refer to [4] for their operator-sum representations, and below we visualize them as the Bloch vector transformations in turn:

$$\begin{aligned} &BF:(r_x,r_y,r_z)\rightarrow(r_x,(2p-1)r_y,(2p-1)r_z),\\ &PF:(r_x,r_y,r_z)\rightarrow((2p-1)r_x,(2p-1)r_y,r_z),\\ &BPF:(r_x,r_y,r_z)\rightarrow((2p-1)r_x,r_y,(2p-1)r_z),\\ &DE:(r_x,r_y,r_z)\rightarrow((1-p)r_x,(1-p)r_y,(1-p)r_z),\\ &PD:(r_x,r_y,r_z)\rightarrow(r_x\sqrt{1-\lambda},r_y\sqrt{1-\lambda},r_z),\\ &AD:(r_x,r_y,r_z)\rightarrow(r_x\sqrt{1-\lambda},r_y\sqrt{1-\lambda},r_z(1-\lambda)+\lambda). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Therefore, by using Eq. (9) (or Eq. (13)) and the above transformations, it is easy to get the minimum error probability for discriminating the above quantum operations.

In fact, bit flip, phase flip, bit-phase flip, and depolarizing channels are generalized by the more general quantum operations—Pauli channels defined as:

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho)=\sum_{i=0}^{3}q_i\sigma_i\rho\sigma_i, \tag{16}$$

where $\{\sigma_0,\sigma_1,\sigma_2,\sigma_3\}=\{I,\sigma_x,\sigma_y,\sigma_z\}$ are the Pauli operators [4], $\sum_i q_i=1$, and $q_i\geq 0$ for any i. Discrimination of Pauli channels was discussed in detail for both entanglement strategy and non-entanglement strategy by [9, 10], and the minimum error probability $P_E(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2)$ for them was derived by an elaborate calculation. However, below we will give a more intuitional and visual derivation of $P_E(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2)$, based on the Bloch representation. At starting, we give a lemma as follows.

Lemma 2. Let $\mathcal{E}(\rho)=\sum_{i=0}^{3}q_i\sigma_i\rho\sigma_i$ be the Pauli channel on a single qubit. Then $\mathcal{E}$ corresponds to the Bloch vector transformation as follows:

$$\vec{r}\rightarrow\vec{r}\,'=M\vec{r} \tag{17}$$

where $M=diag\{\Delta_1,\Delta_2,\Delta_3\}$, and $\Delta_i=2(q_0+q_i)-1$.

Proof. Firstly, note that for the Pauli operators [4], we have $\sigma_i\sigma_j\sigma_i=\begin{cases}-\sigma_j & j\neq i\\ \sigma_i & j=i\end{cases}$ for $i,j=1,2,3$. Then we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\rho)=&\sum_{i=0}^{3}q_i\sigma_i\frac{I+\vec{r}\cdot\vec{\sigma}}{2}\sigma_i\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\Big[I+(q_0+q_1-q_2-q_3)r_1\sigma_1\\ &+(q_0-q_1+q_2-q_3)r_2\sigma_2\\ &+(q_0-q_1-q_2+q_3)r_3\sigma_3\Big]\\ =&\frac{1}{2}[I+(M\vec{r})\cdot\vec{\sigma}], \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where M is defined as above. This completes the proof. $\square$

Now, for the two Pauli channels

$$\mathcal{E}_1(\rho)=\sum_{i=0}^{3} q_i^{(1)}\sigma_i\rho\sigma_i, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_2(\rho)=\sum_{i=0}^{3} q_i^{(2)}\sigma_i\rho\sigma_i, \tag{19}$$

by Lemma 2, we know that $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ have 2-tuple representations $(M_1,\vec{0})$ and $(M_2,\vec{0})$, respectively. Then by Eq. (13), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P_E(\mathcal{E}_1,\mathcal{E}_2) \\ =& \frac{1}{2}\Big[1-\max\{|p_1-p_2|,||p_1M_1-p_2M_2||_2\}\Big] \\ =& \frac{1}{2}\Big[1-\max\{|p_1-p_2|,C\}\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C=\max\Big\{&|r_0+r_1-r_2-r_3|,|r_0+r_2-r_1-r_3|, \\ &|r_0+r_3-r_1-r_2|\Big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

and $r_i=p_1q_i^{(1)}-p_2q_i^{(2)}$ for $i=0,1,2,3$.

In Eq. (20), if $C\leq|p_1-p_2|$, then $P_E=\min\{p_1,p_2\}$, and thus, no exploring input state is needed as pointed out before. Else, the optimal exploring input state has Bloch vector that is the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of $p_1M_1-p_2M_2$.

We note that discrimination of Pauli channels was already discussed in [9, 10], where the minimum error probability in the non-entanglement strategy was given as

$$P_E=\frac{1}{2}(1-M), \tag{22}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} M=\max\Big\{&|r_0+r_3|+|r_1+r_2|,|r_0+r_1|+|r_2+r_3|, \\ &|r_0+r_2|+|r_1+r_3|\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

In fact, one can verify that Eqs. (20) and (22) are equivalent by using Lemma 1 and by noting that $p_1-p_2=r_0+r_1+r_2+r_3$. However, as we can see, our method is based on the Bloch representation of single qubit systems, and thus, it is more intuitional and visual than the way used in [9, 10].

III. PERFECT DISCRIMINATION OF QUANTUM OPERATIONS

In this section, we consider the condition for perfect discrimination of two quantum operations. Preliminarily, it is useful to introduce the notion of *numerical range* [17]. Consider a quantum system with a finite dimensional state space $\mathcal{H}$. Let A be a linear operator acting on $\mathcal{H}$. The *numerical range* (or the *field of values*) [17] of A is defined as

$$F(A)=\{\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle:|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H} \text{ with } \langle\psi|\psi\rangle=1\}. \tag{24}$$

The numerical range is an important set that captures some information about linear operators. Specially, for normal operator A, the numerical range is the convex hull of the eigenvalues of A, whereas no similar analytical characterization of numerical range is known for general linear operators.

A nonzero $|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}$ is said to be an *isotropic vector* for a given linear operator A on $\mathcal{H}$ if $\langle\psi|A|\psi\rangle=0$, and $|\psi\rangle$ is further said to be a *common isotropic vector* for linear operators $A_1,\dots,A_m$ if $\langle\psi|A_i|\psi\rangle=0$ for $i=1,\dots,m$. Using the above notion, we give a necessary and sufficient condition for two quantum operations to be perfectly distinguishable as follows.

Theorem 1. Given two quantum operations

$$\mathcal{E}_1(\rho)=\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} E_i^{(1)}\rho E_i^{(1)\dagger}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_2(\rho)=\sum_{j=1}^{n_2} E_j^{(2)}\rho E_j^{(2)\dagger}. \tag{25}$$

Then:

(i) $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ can be perfectly discriminated with non-entanglement strategy if and only if the set $\{E_i^{(1)\dagger}E_j^{(2)}:i=1,\dots,n_1,\ j=1,\dots,n_2\}$ has a common isotropic vector $|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}$.

(ii) $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ can be perfectly discriminated with entanglement strategy if and only if the set $\{E_i^{(1)\dagger}E_j^{(2)}\otimes I:i=1,\dots,n_1,\ j=1,\dots,n_2\}$ has a common isotropic vector $|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}\otimes\mathcal{K}$

Proof. We have a detailed proof for part (i), and the proof for part (ii) is similar. We know that the minimum error probability can always be achieved by a pure input state. Then, that $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ can be perfectly discriminated is equivalent to that there exists a pure state $|\psi\rangle\in\mathcal{H}$, such that the output density operators are mutual orthogonal, i.e., they have mutual orthogonal support. The support of density operator ρ, denoted by *supp*(ρ), is defined as the space spanned by the eigenvectors corresponding to the no-zero eigenvalues of ρ. We denote

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1\equiv\mathcal{E}_1(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)=\sum_{i=1}^{n_1}E_i^{(1)}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|E_i^{(1)\dagger}, \\ \rho_2\equiv\mathcal{E}_2(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)=\sum_{j=1}^{n_2}E_j^{(2)}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|E_j^{(2)\dagger}. \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} supp(\rho_1)=span\{E_i^{(1)}|\psi\rangle:i=1,\dots,n_1\}, \\ supp(\rho_2)=span\{E_j^{(2)}|\psi\rangle:j=1,\dots,n_2\}. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Here it is readily seen that $supp(\rho_1) \perp supp(\rho_2)$ if and only if $E_i^{(1)}|\psi\rangle \perp E_j^{(2)}|\psi\rangle$, i.e., $\langle\psi|E_i^{(1)\dagger}E_j^{(2)}|\psi\rangle = 0$ for any i and j. Therefore, we have proven the first part of this theorem. For the strategy with entangled input, we have a similar proof, and thus we omit that. $\square$

In Theorem 1, it is easy to see that two quantum operations that can be perfectly discriminated by non-entanglement strategy are necessary to be perfectly distinguishable by entanglement strategy. However, the contrary implication is not true by noting the later example.

Notably, when two unitary operations U_1 and U_2 are considered, the condition for perfect discrimination between them reduces to that $\langle\psi|U_1^\dagger U_2|\psi\rangle = 0$ for some input state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, i.e., the polygon of the eigenvalues of $U_1^\dagger U_2$ encircles the origin, which was discussed in Refs. [6, 7].

Theorem 1 implies that it is generally difficult to decide whether two quantum operations are perfectly distinguishable. However, it will be easy in some special cases as we will show below. In the following, we consider the condition for two Pauli channels to be perfectly distinguishable. For that, we discuss a more general case, that is, discriminating the following quantum operations [9, 10]:

$$\mathcal{E}_i(\rho) = \sum_{n=0}^{d^2-1} q_n^{(i)} U_n \rho U_n^\dagger, \quad \sum_n q_n^{(i)} = 1, \text{ and } q_n^{(i)} \geq 0, \tag{28}$$

with $\mathrm{Tr}(U_m^\dagger U_n) = d\delta_{mn}$. From the above form, we know that $\mathcal{E}_i$ has operator-sum element set $\{\sqrt{q_n^{(i)}}U_n\}$. Also, we can see that when the orthogonal set $\{U_n\}$ is fixed, $\mathcal{E}_i$ is unique determined by the unit d^2-dimensional vector $\mathbf{q^{(i)}} = (\sqrt{q_0^{(i)}}, \ldots, \sqrt{q_{d^2-1}^{(i)}})$, which is called the *characteristic vector* of $\mathcal{E}_i$. As we can see, when $d = 2$, these operations reduce to the Pauli channels [9, 10]. Thus, we call these quantum operations defined above as *general Pauli channels* (GPCs). For these general Pauli channels, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Two GPCs $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ are perfectly distinguishable with entangled strategy, if and only if their characteristic vectors are orthogonal.

Proof. Suppose that $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ have characteristic vectors $\mathbf{q^{(1)}} = [\sqrt{q_i^{(1)}}]$ and $\mathbf{q^{(2)}} = [\sqrt{q_i^{(2)}}]$, respectively. Then from Theorem 1, we know that $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ are perfectly distinguishable with entangled strategy if and only if the following hold:

$$\sqrt{q_i^{(1)}q_j^{(2)}}\langle\psi|U_i^\dagger U_j \otimes I|\psi\rangle = 0 \tag{29}$$

for $i, j = 0, \ldots, d^2 - 1$ and some $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{K}$. Let $i = j$ in Eq. (29). Then we have

$$\sqrt{q_i^{(1)}q_i^{(2)}} = 0, \quad \text{for} \quad i = 0, \ldots, d^2 - 1, \tag{30}$$

which is equivalent to $\mathbf{q^{(1)}} \perp \mathbf{q^{(2)}}$. Now we have verified the necessity.

Next suppose that $\mathbf{q^{(1)}} \perp \mathbf{q^{(2)}}$ holds, i.e., Eq. (30) holds. Let us recall the notation of Ref. [18] for bipartite state

$$|A\rangle\rangle = \sum_{n,m} A_{nm}|n\rangle \otimes |m\rangle, \tag{31}$$

and there are properties:
(i) $A \otimes B|C\rangle\rangle = |ACB^T\rangle\rangle$;
(ii) $\langle\langle A|B\rangle\rangle = \mathrm{Tr}(A^\dagger B)$;
(iii) any maximal entangled state can be represented as $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}|V\rangle\rangle$, where V is a unitary matrix.

Then using the notation introduced above, for any maximal entangled state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}|V\rangle\rangle$, and for any i, j, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{q_i^{(1)}q_j^{(2)}}\langle\psi|U_i^\dagger U_j \otimes I|\psi\rangle \\ =&\frac{1}{d}\sqrt{q_i^{(1)}q_j^{(2)}}\langle\langle U_iV|U_jV\rangle\rangle \\ =&\frac{1}{d}\sqrt{q_i^{(1)}q_j^{(2)}}\mathrm{Tr}(V^\dagger U_i^\dagger U_j V) \\ =&\sqrt{q_i^{(1)}q_j^{(2)}}\delta_{ij} \\ =&0 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Thus, from Theorem 1, $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ are perfectly distinguishable by the maximal entangled state $|\psi\rangle$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Notably, the condition given in the above theorem is also a necessary condition for $\mathcal{E}_1$ and $\mathcal{E}_2$ to be perfectly distinguishable with non-entanglement strategy. However, it is not sufficient. An example of this case is two channels of the form

$$\mathcal{E}_1(\rho) = \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta} q_\alpha \sigma_\alpha \rho \sigma_\alpha, \ \mathcal{E}_2(\rho) = \sigma_\beta \rho \sigma_\beta, \tag{33}$$

with $q_\alpha \neq 0$, as *a priori* probability.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we addressed the problem of discrimination between quantum operations. For the single qubit quantum operations, we obtained the exact minimum error probability with non-entanglement strategy. For the Pauli channels discussed in [9, 10], we gave a more intuitional and visual solution to their discrimination problem. We gave a necessary and sufficient condition for two quantum operations to be perfectly distinguishable, and as an application, we found that two generalized Pauli operations are perfectly distinguishable if and only if their characteristic vectors are orthogonal.

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation (Nos. 90303024, 60573006), the Research Foundation for the Doctorial Program of Higher

School of Ministry of Education (No. 20050558015), and the Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province (No. 031541) of China.

[1] C. W. Helstrom, *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory* (Academic Press, New York, 1976).

[2] I. D. Ivanovic, Phys. Lett. A **123**, 257 (1987); D. Dieks, *ibid.* **126**, 303 (1988); A. Peres, *ibid.* **128**, 19 (1988); G. Jaeger and A. Shimony, *ibid.* **197**, 83 (1995); A. Chefles, *ibid.* **239**, 339 (1998).

[3] J. Bergou, U. Herzog, and M. Hillery, *Quantum State Estimation*, Lecture Notes in Physics Vol. 649 (Springer, Berlin, 2004), p. 417; A. Chefles, *ibid.* p. 467.

[4] M. A. Nielsen, and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000)

[5] A. M. Childs, J. Preskill, and J. Renes, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 155 (2000).

[6] A. Acín, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 177901 (2001).

[7] G. M. D'Ariano, P. Lo Presti, and M. G. A. Paris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 270404 (2001).

[8] R. Y. Duan, Y. Feng, and M. S. Ying, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 100503 (2007).

[9] M. F. Sacchi, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **7**, S333 (2005).

[10] M. F. Sacchi, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062340 (2005).

[11] G. M. D'Ariano, M. F. Sacchi, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 052302 (2005).

[12] G. Wang, M. S. Ying, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 042301 (2006).

[13] A. Chefles, A. Kitagawa, M. Takeoka, M. Sasaki and J. Twamley, quant-ph/0702245v3.

[14] W. Rudin, *Principles of Mathematical Analysis* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1976).

[15] K. Hunter, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 012306 (2003).

[16] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986).

[17] R. A. Horn, C. R. Johnson, *Topics in Matrix Analysis*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991).

[18] G. M. D'Ariano, P. Lo Presti, and M. F. Sacchi, Phys. Lett. A **272**, 32 (2000).